

MINUTES
Carson City Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, January 25, 2023 ● 5:00 PM
Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Vice Chair – Teri Preston

Commissioner – Ellen DeChristopher

Commissioner – Vern Krahn

Commissioner – Richard Perry

Commissioner – Charles Borders, Jr.

Commissioner – Nathaniel Killgore

Commissioner – Sena Loyd

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney

Stephen Pottéy, Sr. Engineering Project Manager

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner

Tamar Warren, Senior Deputy Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the board’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the Public Meeting Clerk during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder’s Office and are available for review during regular business hours.

The approved minutes of all meetings are available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

1. CALL TO ORDER

(5:05:28) – Vice Chair Preston called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:05:31) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Vice Chair Teri Preston	Present	
Commissioner Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Commissioner Ellen DeChristopher	Present	
Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore	Present	
Commissioner Vern Krahn	Present	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Present	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:06:03) – Vice Chair Preston led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:06:35) – Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments.

(5:07:27) – Betsy Strasburg informed the Commission that Title 17 will be agendized for the Board of Supervisors retreat on March 3, 2023 at Western Nevada College. Deni French wished to see absent commissioners vote electronically, and he recommended that “plain talk” be exercised instead of legal language. He also objected to having marijuana sales in the community. John MacSween read a prepared statement, incorporated into the record, stating his objection to the rezoning of Fairview Business Park (items 6.E and 6.F). Ms. Sullivan suggested hearing Mr. MacSween’s public comment during the appropriate agenda item. Derrick Miles introduced himself as a member of the cannabis industry and recommended that the Commission vote in favor of item 6.G. Heather Koche also spoke regarding Title 17.10 and objected to item 6.G due to the added crime in the City.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – DECEMBER 20, 2022.

(5:20:55) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item and entertained comments or changes; however, none were forthcoming. She also entertained a motion.

(5:21:00) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2022 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-0-3)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Killgore
AYES:	Preston, Borders, Killgore, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	DeChristopher, Krahn, Loyd
ABSENT:	None

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A LU-2022-0492 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM ALTA CONSULTING, LTD (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) FOR A MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON A PROPERTY WITHIN THE SILVER OAK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC-P”) LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SILVER OAK DRIVE AND GS RICHARDS BOULEVARD, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 007-461-19.

(5:22:30) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record, recommended approval, and responded to clarifying questions. Discussion

ensued regarding parking and Ms. Manzo explained that since on-street parking is available adjacent to the site along a portion of GS Richards Boulevard, guest parking is not required. Additionally, she noted that the applicant had proposed a minimum of 303 on-site parking spaces instead of the 356 on-site spaces based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers parking rates for multifamily housing in an urban/suburban setting, adding that the applicant's request for 1.7 parking stalls per unit had been approved once the special use permit is granted. She also clarified that snow storage areas must not utilize any of the parking spaces.

(5:33:51) – Applicant Mark Neuffer introduced himself and stated that he agreed with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. Ms. Manzo clarified that the Special Use Permit would expire in one year which was detailed in Condition of Approval No. 3. Mr. Neuffer explained that the parking enforcement would be handled by the professional management of the units. He also touted the walkability of the project, introduced his team to the Commission, and invited Stacie Huggins, Senior Planner at Wood Rogers, Inc. to present. Ms. Huggins reviewed the project details, incorporated into the record, and responded to the Commissioners' questions. Jason Durr, Project Manager at KRI Architecture + Design, explained that ERCS also known as Emergency Radio Coverage System ensured approved radio coverage for emergency responders to avoid in-building radio degradation. Mr. Neuffer was in favor of installing electric vehicle chargers. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments.

(5:54:18) – Joy Trushenski requested a moratorium on buildings and growth in Carson City noting infrastructure issues. Mr. French reiterated the water and parking issues and opposed the height of the building, preferring lower-rent buildings. Judy Shallenberger who had submitted written public comments opposed the project which she believed would be dangerous to children and cited issues with the snow. Ms. Strasburg also cited infrastructure issues, specifically sewer and signal lights, and objected to the building's height. She also inquired why the development was across the street from the Planned Development Unit (PUD) of which it was a part. Lisa Partee was concerned about water, sewer, and school capacity as well. Richard Nagel inquired about who would maintain the roads at the development. LeAnn Saarem was opposed to the height of the buildings and the parking density and noted that the road is unsafe due to speeders. Roger Arlen noted that the project would impact his view of the mountains and believed it was too large and high. He wished to see a traffic signal instead of a roundabout. Ms. Koche cited safety issues due to congestion and opposed the project because the area was too congested and often flooded. Colleen Schiller wished to receive more detail about the traffic study and was against the loss of the dark skies concept. She also objected to the loss of the rustic/rural look and feel of Carson City with the new developments. Karen Stephens believed the building height was excessive and was against the growth that leads to loss of animal habitat. There were no additional comments.

(6:18:38) – Ms. Manzo addressed the questions relating to the Planning Division. She clarified that the Silver Oak PUD extended to this particular parcel as well and noted that Title 17.10 did not apply to this project as it was zoned Retail Commercial, adding that any roads inside the development would be maintained by the developer/operator. Ms. Manzo clarified that the maximum allowed height in a Retail Commercial zone was 45 feet. She also noted that there were no limitations to the density in that zone and read the following from the Staff Report: "The Master Plan qualifies development with a density of between 8 and 36 dwelling units as high-density residential development. [This] proposal would result in 28.7 dwelling units per acre and would be consistent with residential development within the Mixed-Use Commercial Master Plan land use designation." She also clarified that the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) does not require view preservation; therefore, not evaluated by the Commission. Ms. Manzo

addressed dark skies question noting that shielded lighting that does not extend beyond the property lines would be required for this project.

(6:22:36) – Development Engineering representative Lisa MacIsaac explained that GS Richards Boulevard met the City’s current requirement for “Local Urban Complete Streets.” She clarified that the sewer system was at “theoretical capacity” which was based on the entitled projects, adding that the current capacity was below 50 percent and was being monitored by Public Works and its replacement was being planned. Ms. MacIsaac noted that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had not identified the area as a flood zone; however, appropriate drainage would be required for the project.

(6:24:23) – Bryan Gant, Principal at Wood Rodgers, Inc. explained the traffic analysis process and methodology. Commissioner Perry reviewed the Growth Management process for the City noting that: all the City departments and the School District are required to comment on their growth constraints on an annual basis and are reviewed by the Growth Management Commission. After the review, a Growth Management Plan is recommended to the Board of Supervisors which is either approved or modified. Upon the Board’s approval, the Plan is posted on the City’s website. Commissioner Perry addressed the water issues as well, stating that the City was using less water now than what it had used in 2008. He also addressed the unaffordability of single-family homes for the “service sector” such as teachers and firefighters, adding that this Commission can only recommend to the Board of Supervisors a moratorium in the case of constraints such as sewer and water. Commissioner Perry encouraged reading the Growth Management Plan which highlighted the declining enrollment in Carson City schools and the aging community. He also noted that the Commission responds to a land owner’s or developer’s desire to build on their private land based on the Master Plan and zoning requirements. Commissioner Perry expressed concern that 1.7 parking spaces per unit would not be enough.

(6:33:34) – Commissioner Borders also encouraged members of the public read the Growth Management Plan “to avoid knee-jerk reactions” and reminded everyone that as an appointed body, the Commission’s role is to interpret what’s been put in place by elected officials for the last 20 years. He also noted that the Commissioners cannot vote against a project “just because we don’t like it” and must have a reason to do so. He encouraged providing suggestions to the Board of Supervisors.

(6:36:15) – Commissioner Loyd was informed that GS Richards Boulevard would not have street parking due to the planned bicycle lanes as part of the Complete Streets Project. Vice Chair Preston noted that the Renown medical building was within the height limitations and had relied on the parking in the nearby cul-de-sac, adding that the City has built a perimeter of public lands and trails around the City as open space funded by developer payments to the City. She also believed that “there is builder participation in Carson City’s infrastructure.” Commissioner Perry highlighted the fact that the City limited the new residential water and sewer hookups to a maximum of three percent of the existing hookups; however, only one or two percent of hookups had been reported at least in the last three years.

(6:42:28) – Michael Vicks of Monte Vista Consulting explained that the garages were initially not part of the initial design and would now provide 17 additional parking spaces. Commissioner Perry noted that he would prefer 1.8 parking spaces per unit and Mr. Neuffer was amenable to that. Vice Chair Preston entertained a motion.

(6:45:39) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve Special Use Permit [LU-2022-0492] based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in the

Staff Report, including the addition of Condition No. 14 indicating the parking density shall be 1.8 spaces per unit. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6-1-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Perry
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Krahn, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	Killgore
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(6:46:30) – Vice Chair Preston recessed the meeting.

(6:57:19) – Vice Chair Preston reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

6.B LU-2022-0542 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM CSAC ACQUISITION INC. (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) FOR A MARIJUANA CULTIVATION FACILITY ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (“GI”), LOCATED AT 3535 ARROWHEAD DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 005-053-04.

(6:57:26) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Ferris gave background and reviewed the Staff Report, noting that the Special Use Permit was due to a change of ownership only and with no proposed changes to the previously approved operation. She also noted that due to additional water usage (but below the Growth Management’s threshold), a **Condition of Approval (No. 13) would be added to read: *Within 30 days of the approval of the Special Use Permit, the applicant will submit calculations and pay the difference of the original water and sewer connection fee and the fee for the current water and sewer usage to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.*** Ms. Ferris also noted that no public comments had been received regarding the item.

(7:00:43) – Ms. MacIsaac explained that the original estimate was 1,167 gallons per day for water and 920 gallons per day for sewer; however, the investigation triggered by the Special Use Permit request had indicated that the five-year average had shown that 6,000 gallons of water were used per day; therefore, the new owner would pay the current connection fees at the higher usage rate. Ms. Ferris clarified that an odor issue had come up which had been mitigated immediately.

(7:06:10) – Clint Cates introduced himself as the applicant representative and explained that they had received approval from the Cannabis Compliance Board the day before this meeting and explained that they operate 10 facilities statewide. He also explained that the applicant had read and would comply with all the Conditions of Approval, including the newly introduced Condition No. 13.

(7:07:20) – Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments. Mr. Nagel indicated that murders in Carson City were associated with marijuana and children were being born to mothers smoking cannabis. He wished to see the community “think about this.” There were no other public comments and Vice Chair Preston entertained a motion.

(7:10:556) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve LU-2022-0542, based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report and with the addition of Condition No. 13 read into the record by the Planning Manager. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Killgore
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Killgore, Krahn, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

6.C LU-2022-0540 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM NV AUTOBODY (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW THE EXPANSION OF AN AUTO BODY REPAIR BUSINESS THAT INCLUDES THE INSTALLATION OF A NEW AUTO PAINT BOOTH AND OUTSIDE STORAGE THAT EXCEEDS 20 PERCENT OF THE OVERALL SITE AREA ON A PROPERTY ZONED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (“LI”) LOCATED AT 2344 CONESTOGA DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 008-816-52.

(7:11:46) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Manzo gave background and presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record.

(7:18:23) – Business owner Susan Maroc introduced herself and noted that the paint booth (built in 1985) had been in need of an upgrade when she had purchased the business three years ago. She also noted that she did not have the funds to upgrade the paint booth and the building in addition to paving the parking lot in the back of the business. Public Works Assistant Project Manager Chris Gonzales explained that Conestoga Drive had been widened and Ms. Manzo clarified that the setback from the property line to the road was 30 feet. City Engineer Randall Rice explained that once the Special Use Permit has been approved the City would have no mechanisms in place to track future compliance. He also noted that the normally requested half-street improvements by the applicant were not requested at the time due to the poor condition of the road. Mr. Rice responded to Commissioners’ questions as well.

(7:31:10) – Commissioner Krahn recommended a conditional issuance of a Special Use Permit that allows tracking of the progress made by the applicant. Commissioner Loyd noted that the road had been classified as “serious.” Commissioner Borders believed that a resolution to the puddles in the driveway was more important. Ms. Maroc offered to not park vehicles in the back as she had given up the U-Haul portion of the business. Ms. Manzo clarified that the front-end improvements were not part of the Conditions of Approval. Ms. Maroc noted that she had already purchased the building and had been told that the excavation alone would be over \$85,000. Commissioner Borders was informed by Ms. Manzo that the

emergency access lane was the most important area to be paved. She also believed that adding the following to Condition No. 8 would be possible: *Vehicles should not be parked on unpaved surfaces.* Ms. Sullivan clarified that Condition No. 8 indicated that “the applicant will have plans approved which include paving of the outside area access roads and the vehicle parking and storage areas.” She believed that having unpaved areas would be a limiting factor to Ms. Maroc’s business as she would be unable to park vehicles, including employee cars, on the unpaved portions of the lot. She also believed that the applicant would work with Staff for further clarification. Ms. Maroc hoped to be able to pave the entire lot someday, but she would try to have half of it paved now to satisfy Condition No. 8. She also informed Commissioner Loyd that she would store car parts in the metal containers. Ms. Manzo clarified that the containers were already in place; however, they must be painted in earth tones. Commissioner Perry was in favor of approving the item with no amendments and was informed that the new paint booth would be “California compliant” and environment friendly. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(7:49:31) – Commissioner Perry moved to approve the Special Use Permit LU-2022-0540 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loyd.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Perry
SECONDER:	Loyd
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Krahn, Killgore, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

6.D LU-2022-0541 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM DAVID FLAHERTY (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) FOR THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING PERSONAL STORAGE FACILITY ONTO ADJACENT PROPERTIES AND THE CONTINUATION OF EXISTING NON-CONFORMITIES ON A PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST SIDE OF THE INTERSECTION OF SAGE STREET AND LONE MOUNTAIN DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 002-071-06 THROUGH -09.

(7:50:11) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Manzo reviewed the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Applicant David Flaherty believed that the business would be “a big improvement” and that the area would be cleaned up, adding that he would make additional improvements. Mr. Flaherty noted that he would accept all the Conditions of Approval. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(7:55:38) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the Special Use Permit LU-2022-0541 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Killgore
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Krahn, Killgore, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

ITEMS 6.E AND 6.F

(7:56:26) – Vice Chair Preston introduced items 6.E and 6.F. Both items would be discussed concurrently; however, they would be voted on separately. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, for both items, noted that all written public comments received regarding the item were posted with the agenda materials, and responded to clarifying questions. Ms. Sullivan explained that the item was noticed to change the master plan designation from Mixed-Use Commercial and Medium Density Residential to Mixed-Use Commercial “to give this Commission flexibility” in case they wanted to have a Residential designation. Commissioner Borders noted that most of the lots were residential with the exception of the storage business, which he believed would be non-conforming should the designation change to Residential. Ms. Ferris reviewed the existing zoning for the Commissioners and noted several inconsistencies. She believed that the General Commercial zoning would allow the manufactured home park and create conformity.

(8:08:25) – Commissioner Perry was informed that currently the storage unit and the mobile home park were non-conforming uses, adding that Medium Family Residential zoning would not allow Single-Family Residential zoning. Ms. Ferris confirmed that a Conditional Special Use Permit existed for the mobile home park. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments.

(8:17:33) – Frank Abella introduced himself as a representative of “a lot of the residents behind me.” Mr. Abella noted the traffic in the area in terms of noise, emissions, and speeders at the intersection of Colorado Street and Saliman Road. He also expressed concern about what could be built “in that vacant lot that’s adjacent to Saliman [Road].” Kimberly Adams introduced herself as a resident who lives across the vacant lot and was concerned about a commercial business taking it over and creating a traffic hazard to students using the bus stop across from her home. She also clarified that the mobile home park is occupied by seniors only who walk their pets. Ms. Adams was also concerned about the potential decline of the property values and urged the Board to keep the Single-Family zoning. Jarrod Adams introduced himself as a Carson City resident and a retired Carson City Sheriff’s Office (CCSO) deputy and believed that the zoning change of the parcel at Colorado Street and Saliman Road would be detrimental to the residents.

(8:24:55) – Jason Tingle introduced himself as an area resident and was concerned about his children’s safety. He believed that there were many vacant commercial lots in the City and recommended keeping the zoning residential for the safety of the schoolchildren. Ms. Partee noted the heavy traffic on both Fairview Drive and Colorado Street and suggested grandfathering the mobile home park and the storage unit and allowing them to remain in the Residential zone. Ms. Schiller was concerned about the traffic noise and the traffic near Colorado Street and Saliman Road. She was opposed to Commercial zoning and was concerned about bicycle and pedestrian safety. Ms. Trushenski also spoke in opposition to the Commercial zoning near residential areas and agreed with Mr. Tingle’s comments. Joseph Zich introduced himself as an area resident and believed that the Commercial zoning would be detrimental to the neighborhood. He was also concerned for the safety of the residents. Rhonda Price introduced herself as an area resident and highlighted the current traffic in the area and believed the traffic would be increased with the zoning change which would jeopardize the safety of the students using the bus stop.

(8:36:11) – John MacSween introduced himself as a partner in the MacSween-Hoseit Partnership, owners of Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 010-061-84. He also read into the record his written public comments, incorporated into the record as late material, in which he opposed the zoning change, and urged the Commission to vote against the proposed zoning change. Jessi Tingle introduced herself as an area resident with three children who walk to the area bus stop or walk to school. She expressed concern about the traffic and wished to keep the zoning as is. Ms. Strasburg believed that the Board of Supervisors had supported Conformity to the existing neighborhood and that was her preference as well. There were no additional comments. Vice Chair Preston entertained Commissioner discussion.

(8:42:55) – Commissioner Loyd was informed that the City models had not indicated any plans for the intersection of Saliman Road and Colorado Street and that the recommendations would be presented at the time a project is proposed. Commissioner Killgore thanked members of the public for their comments. Commissioner DeChristopher explained that she had driven through the area and had wondered whether the zoning change would have detrimental impacts on other properties in the vicinity. Commissioner Perry informed Mr. MacSween that the storage facility he owned would become “non-compliant should there be a 12-month lapse in the currently compliant usage” which Mr. MacSween had outlined in his letter. However, Ms. Sullivan clarified that due to the split-zoning of the property, the storage unit would not be prohibited but would be considered a conditional use due to the split-zoned parcel. She also informed Commissioner Perry that “when you have a split-zoned parcel, you can choose to establish a use that’s allowed in one of those uses in one of those zoning districts on the entire parcel with a Special Use Permit.” Discussion ensued regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the zoning changes.

(8:57:49) – Based on the discussion, Ms. Ferris recommended the following:

- On “the westernmost corner parcel” which is currently zoned as Mixed Use and Medium Density Residential, she recommended leaving the Master Plan as is and zoning it as Single Family 6,000 (SF6) and keeping it as conforming use.

- On the “middle parcel,” Ms. Ferris recommended leaving “the Master Plan as is and going with an SF6 zoning, over the Medium Density Residential portion. It remains non-conforming, but it allows for any future development in that area to essentially conform with the neighborhood.”
- As for the mobile home park, “we can leave it as is with the Master Plan and do SF6 zoning over the top of it. It’s still non-conforming but it’s a Residential Use [and] at least the zoning would conform with the Master Plan.

(9:00:18) – Another alternative, according to Ms. Ferris would be to “consider doing the recommended General Commercial zoning with Mixed Use with Commercial Master Plan.” Ms. Sullivan noted that “the Master Plan Makes Sense...we’re dealing with zoning districts that aren’t consistent with Master Plan. It’s not simply academic.”

(9:04:55) – Ms. Adams received confirmation that the Light Industrial zoning would no longer be considered in Ms. Ferris’ recommendation.

6.E MPA-2023-0007 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY (“APPLICANT”) FOR THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT AND RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (“BOARD”) TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION FROM MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL (“MUC”) AND MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (“MDR”) TO MUC FOR THREE PARCELS LOCATED SOUTH OF FAIRVIEW DRIVE, NORTH OF COLORADO STREET, AND EAST OF S. SALIMAN ROAD, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 010-061-76, 010-061-84, AND 010-061-87.

(9:05:20) – Based on the discussion above, no action would be required on this item according to Ms. Sullivan as no changes would be proposed.

6.F ZA-2023-0008 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (“BOARD”) CONCERNING A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY (“APPLICANT”) FOR A PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (“LI”), SINGLE-FAMILY 1-ACRE (“SF1A”) AND SINGLE-FAMILY 6,000 (“SF6”) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) FOR THREE PARCELS LOCATED SOUTH OF FAIRVIEW DRIVE, NORTH OF COLORADO STREET, AND EAST OF S. SALIMAN ROAD, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 010-061-76, 010-061-84, AND 010-061-87.

(9:05:40) – Ms. Ferris summarized the zoning discussion above and reiterated the following:

- “The zoning for the parcel to the west, at the corner of Saliman [Road] and Colorado [Street], would be changed from Limited Industrial and Single-Family 1 Acre to Single Family 6,000.”

- “The zoning for the parcel in the middle, between Fairview [Drive] and Colorado [Street], we’d be looking at leaving the Limited Industrial zoning as is and modifying the zoning from Single Family 1 Acre to Single Family 6,000 for the southern portion.”
- “[For] the parcel that is the mobile home park, the Single Family 6,000 zoning would be applied to the entire parcel. So, Limited Industrial would be amended to Single Family 6,000.”

(9:07:10) – Commissioner Borders moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the zoning map amendment ZA-2023-0008 as discussed and summarized by the Planning Manager. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Preston.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Preston
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Krahn, Killgore, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(9:07:44) – Vice Chair Preston recessed the meeting.

(9:17:31) – Vice Chair Preston reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

6.G ZA-2022-0519 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (“BOARD”) CONCERNING AN APPLICATION FROM WILL ADLER ON BEHALF OF GREEN THUMB INDUSTRIES INC. (“APPLICANT”) FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING LOCATION LIMITATIONS FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES AND MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES.

(9:17:35) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan gave background and presented the Staff Report with the accompanying documentation and responded to clarifying questions.

(9:26:37) – Applicant representative Will Adler, Principal at Silver State Government Relations, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record, introducing Green Thumb Industries, Inc. He also discussed the current zoning for cannabis sales and proposed a zoning change to open a second retail location in the North Carson area to accommodate their second license. Mr. Adler cited the lack of available property in the current zoning areas, which had led his clients to their zoning expansion request. Mr. Adler also responded to Commissioner questions. Vice Chair Preston entertained public comments.

(9:43:01) – Ms. Strasburg reiterated the contents of her written public comments, incorporated into the record as late material, in which she recommended that the Commission deny the applicant’s request for a

zoning change for several reasons that she outlined in her written comments. Ms. Partee objected to the proposed location because of its proximity to the Talents Athletic Center and to a private school on the corner of Jeanell Drive and Russet Way. Mr. Nagel objected to the proposed zoning due to the presence of an alternative high school in the area, and due to the proximity to a private school nearby. He also believed that the Board of Supervisors should not be able to vote on the item and have the community vote on it. Mr. Nagel explained that the recent shootings by teens were marijuana-related. Mr. French objected to having marijuana dispensaries even though the citizens voted against it. He also expressed concern regarding the health issues related to secondhand smoke and the fact that there are too many dispensaries in Carson City. LeAnn Saarem noted her agreement with the previous commenters and noted the availability of cannabis through delivery. She also objected to the locations because they were not vetted and could be near new schools, adding that she wanted “microscopic expansion.”

(9:58:20) – Ms. Sullivan explained that the City allowed four marijuana retail stores and it currently has two, with location criteria that limit their presence to South Carson Street and to William Street. She stated that the item being discussed is not about how many stores to have but to determine whether or not the proposed North Carson Street location would be an acceptable location. Discussion ensued regarding the proposed location. Mr. Adler explained that the location restrictions are one-way as any establishment could choose to move near a dispensary if they wish to do so. Ms. Sullivan read the following excerpt from CCMC regarding cannabis locations:

A Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Retail Marijuana Store is prohibited on any property, or within a shopping center with frontage, that is located on the same street on which a residentially zoned property is also located unless the dispensary or store is located more than three hundred (300) feet from the residential property, as measured on a straight line from the nearest residential property line abutting the street right-of-way to the front door of the dispensary or store.

(10:09:43) – Commissioner Perry thanked Mr. Adler for making the suggested changes; however, he stated that he would not support the item because he could not make Finding No. 3 due to the location’s proximity to too many children and residences. There were no additional comments; therefore, Vice Chair Preston entertained a motion.

(10:11:02) – Commissioner Borders moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the requested zoning code amendment based on the ability to make the findings as outlined in the staff report, with the northern boundary being Medical Parkway and Arrowhead Drive. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Krahn.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-3-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Krahn
AYES:	Borders, Killgore, Krahn, Loyd
NAYS:	Preston, DeChristopher, Perry
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(10:13:01) – Commissioner DeChristopher and Vice Chair Preston explained that their “nay” vote was based on the inability to make Finding No. 3.

6.H FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ELECT A PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR.

(10:13:50) – Vice Chair Preston introduced the item and entertained nominations.

(10:14:01) – Commissioner DeChristopher moved to nominate Vice Chair Preston to the position of Planning Commission Chair. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	DeChristopher
SECONDER:	Perry
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Killgore, Krahn, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(10:14:20) – Chairperson Elect Preston moved to nominate Commissioner Loyd to the position of Planning Commission Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Preston
SECONDER:	Perry
AYES:	Preston, Borders, DeChristopher, Killgore, Krahn, Loyd, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

15. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(10:14:50) – Ms. Sullivan noted that several Special Use Permits and the Anderson Ranch Project would be agendized for the next meeting. She also announced that the Board of Supervisors had agreed with the Commission’s recommendations regarding the Master Plan Review that she had presented to the Board, stating that Land Use Compatibility with the Carson City Airport would be added to the Annual Report. Ms. Sullivan also noted that the Title 18 discussion during the Board of Supervisors retreat on March 3, 2023 at Western Nevada College would take place in the afternoon. Vice Chair Elect Loyd requested the supporting documents in advance.

16. PUBLIC COMMENT

(10:15:50) – Chairperson Elect Preston welcomed Clerk-Recorder Scott Hoen and thanked him for attending the meeting.

(10:21:13) – Mr. French thanked the Commissioners for attending the meeting and for voting and reiterated his request for the Commissioners to vote remotely.

17. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(10:23:25) – Chairperson Preston adjourned the meeting at 10:23 p.m.

The Minutes of the January 25, 2023 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 22nd day of February, 2023.

Cecilia Rice

From: Judy Shallenberger <jshallenberger@antiagingmedicine.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 2:57 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: LU-2022-0492

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

To: Heather Ferris
Re: 178- Unit multi-family residential project

Dear Heather,

I will be attending the meeting in regards to the above named project, and to that point have serious concerns as follows:

1. What studies have been done in regards to the traffic impact this will have in a tight Medical Complex? There are two ingress and egress areas to access this proposed apartment complex
2. If there are an average of three persons in each unit and they all drive; this would result in having upwards of 500 cars driving through a very small area.
3. Having had a medical clinic in this area for over then years, I am concerned for the overall peaceful and quiet environment turning into a busy, traffic burdened area.
4. Many elder persons drive to and from doctors appointments and I am concerned that young children, bike riding, skate boarding and things children naturally do may cause safety problems and disruptions in ingress and egress.

I understand this is zoned for commercial and residential, but it has always been my understanding that when this was decided it was to be more in tuned to the "My Place" adult care facility across the street off College Parkway? A One hundred, seventy eight Multi Family Unit is the stark and uncomplimentary opposite to persons conducting business in a Medical Parkway.

Kind Regards,

Judy Shallenberger
Clinic Director
Nevada Center, Inc.
1231 Country Club Drive
Carson City, NV 89703
775-884-3990 ext. 113

From: Sue Maroc <nvautobodycarsoncity@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 1:53 PM

To: Heather Manzo <HManzo@carson.org>

Subject: Re: LU-2022-0540









This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I do not have the money to pave the back parking lot or fix the driveway entrance or the drainage issues but it looks like I won't get my SUP if I don't so I will have to figure something out.

I contacted the Public Works department about the condition of Conestoga Dr, with all the additional truck traffic it is falling apart. It is less than 23 feet wide in a few spots and that isn't enough room for 2 semi-trucks and this causes trucks to drive on the edges and the problem is getting worse. I am attaching some photos because you said you didn't notice the condition of the road when you did the site visit. Carson City does not have the money to fix the road and has no plans to according to Rick Cooley. I am frustrated that I, as a small business owner, am required to do work to the apron and drainage but the City is not.

With the vacant lots on either side of me I am not sure what you want me to do about the drainage ditch. It is just going to pool to the West.

So these are some of my concerns.

Also, the wild mustangs that walk down the street daily want to know what kind of bushes I will be planting 😊

Sue

1:07



To: suemaroc65@gmail.com >



Closed Request # 4959 [3736326564356164]

---If replying by email, enter your reply above this line---

Hello,

Your request # 4959 has been resolved with the resolution:

Susan- Thank you for taking my call.

Unfortunately this road will not get replaced anytime in the near future. However I will have our crews take a look at what we can do in the Spring when things dry out to possibly shore up the shoulders and try to hold it together for a while longer. Rick Cooley [283-7302](tel:283-7302)

This is in reference to the Problem on Curb, Gutter & Sidewalk Repair you submitted on 12/08/2022

1:58 PM

Location: 2401 Conestoga Drive

Description: The road is crumbling





On Thu, Jan 19, 2023 at 3:49 PM Heather Manzo <HManzo@carson.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon Sue,

The staff report package posted this morning. Here is the link to the [01.25.2023 Planning Commission Agenda](#).

Please be sure to read through the staff report, particularly the conditions of approval and the Development Engineering analysis and let me know if any of the conditions or code requirements warrant discussion.

Sincerely,

Heather Manzo

Associate Planner

[108 E. Proctor Street](#)

[Carson City, NV 89701](#)

(775) 283-7075

hmanzo@carson.org



--

NV Auto Body
2344 Conestoga Drive
Carson City NV 89706
775-882-0777

Cecilia Rice

From: Lori Teakle <livingstonedevgp@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 21, 2023 11:34 AM
To: Planning Department; Heather Ferris; Lori Teakle
Subject: LU-2022-0541 Application, David Flaherty's SUP

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Ms. Ferris and Commissioners,

Please approve his application.

Mr. Flaherty will be investing in his business and thereby increasing our tax base.

This is an extremely dense area. With all the mobile homes and apartments in the neighborhood surely there is a demand for growth of his business.

Approval will 1) keep personal property from cluttering park spaces, 2) keep the parks and homeowners compliant with NRS and Rules & Regulations, and 3) improve health, welfare, appearance and relationships of apartment dwellers, parks and mobile home owners.

Consideration should also be given to the many residents in the area who do not drive. Having storage within walking distance is critical to their lifestyle and easing their burdens.

It is my opinion that we've had enough government intervention that chokes out small business owners from making profits and expanding. Small business profits are the backbone of this nation... or perhaps we should all be honest with ourselves and say *they were* the backbone of this nation. Please help turn that tide with this one small vote. Every one of your actions directly effect this nation - you are either tearing it down or building it up to its former greatness. Please do the right thing for America.

Lori N. Teakle
Owner, 30 Zephyr Circle, Carson City, NV 89706
775/720-5016 Cellular

Cecilia Rice

From: tifabnor <tifabnor@att.net>
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2023 2:34 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Public Comment foqr Public Hearing on Januar

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Regarding: MPA-2023-0007
ZA-2023-0008

Good Morning;

My husband and I became concerned after receiving notification that The Growth Management Commission and Planning Commission will be presented with a plan to consider a designation change to Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 010-061-76 from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Mixed-Used Commercial (MUC). Also under consideration for this parcel is changing the zoning from Limited Industrial (LI) and Single-Family 6,000 (SF6) to General Commercial (GC). APN 010-061-76 is the parcel of land where Parc de Maison is located.

Parc de Maison, a 55 plus residential manufactured home park was established in the late 80's where over 160 homes are located. Parc de Maison is not a Recreational Vehicle (RV) or trailer park; it is a permanent residential community. Many of the residents have lived in their homes for many years and are elderly. One major concern about this change would be if the owner decided to establish a business on the land. This would force residents to either move their homes or sell and try to find another place to live.

It is unclear why the three separate parcels of land under consideration have to all be designated/zoned the same. If a parcel is designated MPR, and zoned LI/SF6, does this ensure no businesses could be built on that land in the future? During a prior meeting regarding this matter, a Planning Commissioner mentioned it would be nice to have a gas station off the Fairview exit, which is concerning. It was also mentioned during this meeting that a manufactured home community cannot be "labeled" or zoned as residential, which is unclear and appears to be an antiquated rule.

If you must rezone and/or re-designate these parcels, please consider only changing the other two parcels and leave APN 010-061-76 as it is.

Thank you,

Barbara and Dennis Taylor
2202 Bordeaux St
Carson City NV 89701
775 881 8319 was

Cecilia Rice

From: Kristy Danner <krisdanner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 12:01 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Objection to proposed parcel Colorado/Saliman....

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Members of the Carson City Planning Commission and The Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Kristy Danner and I am currently a homeowner on the corner of Colorado and Fieldcrest. We purchased our home in this neighborhood because our children attended Seeliger Elementary from K-5th grade and I currently work there. This neighborhood is a tight knit, family oriented community.

We have tons of middle and high schoolers that walk to and from the corner of Colorado and Saliman, the proposed parcel you would like to change from Light Industrial (north half) & Single Family 6,000 (south half) to General Commercial, to catch the bus to and from school. By changing the zoning to General Commercial you're allowing an already unsafe strip of the neighborhood to become even more dangerous. Too many people do not stop for the bus, nor pedestrians. People are always speeding on Saliman and Colorado.

The residents that live in the gated community on Colorado utilize Colorado for parking. If this becomes industrial, parking for residents and family members will become scarce. Any type of industrial allowed business can cause unwanted traffic and harm to our neighborhood.

My point is, this is a neighborhood that families utilize for walks, bike rides, exercise, walking pets, etc. If you were to sit on my porch for one afternoon, I guarantee you could count at least 20 people walking by on a daily basis. If our neighborhood turns into an industrial zone with increased traffic and people constantly coming and going, our neighborhood could become unsafe. I'm sure most of us who live within this vicinity would agree that they never would have purchased a home here if there were plans for a possible auto repair shop, nightclub, tire shop, pool hall, etc. on the corner of a well established neighborhood.

Carson City Planning Commission, I strongly ask that you Deny MPA-2023-007 and ZA-2023-0008.

Board of Supervisors, I strongly ask that you Deny Resolution Number 2023-PC-R-1 and Deny ZA-2023-0008.

Thank you for your time,

Kristy Danner

8 year resident in this neighborhood

Cecilia Rice

From: toni ccsihvac.com <toni@ccsihvac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 12:46 PM
To: Heather Ferris
Cc: TONI THOMAS; Ron Foreman; Planning Department
Subject: ZA-2023-0008

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Good Afternoon Heather,

I am writing in reference to ZA-2023-008 the matter of rezoning the parcels on Saliman between Fairview and Colorado to General Commercial. We live on the corner of Jodi and Saliman, directly across the street from this parcel. We are requesting that you please reconsider this change. Our street is already too dangerous with the traffic that flows now. If business's that can operate at all hours of the day are directly across the street from us the traffic will be much worse and way more dangerous. Not to mention the noise factor. Unless the City is going to close off the entrance to Jodi Lane from Saliman and put up a sound barrier wall all the way down this will be beyond tolerable. Please we request that all factors are considered before making this decision.

Thank you,

Ron & Toni Foreman
2010 Jodi Lane
Carson City NV 89701

LATE MATERIAL
PASSED OUT TO PL. COMMISSION
1.25.23

**ZA_2022-0519 – Public Comment opposing expansion of marijuana dispensaries and retail stores
Betsy Strasburg**

Per CCMC 18.02.075:

A Zoning Map Amendment or Zoning Code Amendment may be initiated by a majority of the Commission or Board, or an owner of real property. The Director shall investigate each application to assure that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of this title.

This application do not show ownership of any parcel. The Planning Dept. and the DA's office have stated that have reviewed Mr. Adler's application and feels that it satisfies the requirement of ownership. We, the taxpayers, have a right to know as do you, Commissioners, that the first condition of an ordinance change has been met. It is public disclosure of staff findings. Please address this first. If this is not correctly applied, the rest of the discussion is moot.

1. Board of Supervisors approved the increase from 2 to 4 marijuana stores reliant on the other existing codes. Supervisor Giomi made a motion to require the DA's office to look at the regulations. Had it not been the need for expediency desired by the Mayor and the hesitancy of the DA's office to commit to a quick turnaround due to resource constraints, the motion would not been withdrawn.
2. The 6 supplementary standards w.r.t Marijuana stores are inadequate. Example: 300 feet from a residential property is insufficient.
3. Just because the Planning commission can vote on a SUP should not be used as a justification to expand location limitations, equivalent to kicking the ball down the road, without due consideration of additional regulations. This justification is used for condition 2 and 3.
4. State Regulations do not surpass local regulations – Douglas County has no marijuana stores.
5. There are no basis to say that 6 years of experience sufficient? The Sheriff has provided testimony that he had no problems with the two marijuana stores. He did not, and cannot, testify on the impact of marijuana on our community. There are no tests to detect marijuana. The Legislature has conducted a meeting on marijuana usage among pregnant women. There is trend towards high potency marijuana. **With all these factors, to say 6 years is sufficient to determine adverse impact on public health, safety or welfare under condition 3 is far-reaching.** We do not need to be leading edge of experimentation in our community.
6. The entire Carson Street corridor from Winnie to Medical Parkway is used for the expansion zone to avoid being a cluster of cannabis stores. How can there be a cluster when marijuana stores are 1 to 2 miles apart. Just as Supervisor White and Jones said that **they should not protect profitability** of existing marijuana stores by **NOT increasing the # of stores**. The City should not **eliminate location limitations** to protect profitability as well.
7. **I request the Commission to reject this application until the DA's office can provide additional regulations to protect the community as Supervisor Giomi was trying to do and only if the applicant is an owner of a parcel and can request an ordinance change.**



301 West Washington Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
775.884.1896 O
775.884.4896 F
www.nvcg.us

January 24, 2023

Chair Wiggins and the Carson City Planning Commission,

Nevada Commercial Group would like to take this opportunity to inform the Carson City Planning Commission of our efforts to locate a suitable zoned location for a new retail cannabis store. As the Planning Commission is aware, the Carson City Board of Supervisors recently doubled the number of retail cannabis stores at their September 15, 2022 meeting. As such, our client (Green Thumb Industries, Inc.) has found themselves in need of a dispensary location for their second, yet to be perfected, license in Carson City.

To accomplish this, we've gone through an extensive search of all the general and retail commercial properties in Carson City and have discovered no commercially viable locations within Carson City's currently allowed general commercial zoned areas for cannabis. Currently, several properties have been located, but all of them fall outside of Carson City's allowable township zoning region for retail cannabis stores. To rectify the lack of property, we'd ask the Carson City Planning Commission to allow the changes asked for in GTI's zoning change request to move forward, as they would open up additional retail properties in the north end of town where the majority of viable retail locations are located to date.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Rocky Joy", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

Rocky Joy

Broker/Salesman

Nevada Commercial Group

Late Material
Planning Commission
Item G-E
1/25/2023

I am John MacSween, a partner in the MacSween-Hoseit Partnership,
which owns parcel 010-061084 located at 1601 Fairview.

We have been paying taxes and developing this property since 1983, that
is 40 years.

Carson City charges a high price for their services and sets high standards
for developing property, and they provide quality service and are
consistent. This environment has allowed a business like ours to flourish
and grow.

Now after 40 years we are confronted with a down zoning of our developed
parcel that will put our business operations out of compliance.

1. According to planning, If there is a 12 month lapse in the currently
compliant usage, then you cannot go back to that usage.
2. If a future tenant is looking for space and is doing their "Due
Dilligance" and checking the zoning, they will be steered away from
our business park because they would not realize that we were

operating under an exception, a so called, grandfathered clause. And we would lose that tenant without ever having the opportunity to explain.

- a. In this business, it is difficult to find good tenants. We have had units sit empty for over a year. Initially renting a space, is the hard part and once people move in, we have been very fortunate and they stay a long time. We have had some tenants over 35 years. This zoning change would be devastating to our ability to rent vacant units.
3. We would be operating in the grips of a constrictor where any wrong move would result in losing the exception to the zoning change, and eventually the zoning change will be in place with no exception allowed, or remembered by the public or to the City Planning employees that are directing and coordinating the planning.
4. This down zoning of our parcel will be a slow death of the zoning, to which we have developed the property to comply.

Over 70% of our warehouse tenants require the Limited Industrial zoning.

We have developed the property in a way that best serves those long term

tenants. We have actually developed a diverse community of tenants that works very well together. Much of this development has been accomplished by intentional steering and good fortune. And this has resulted in a stable, cohesive, community of businesses at Fairview Business Park.

The single family residence is necessary for safety and security to prevent break ins, and should not be zoned out.

What is the economic impact of this down zoning?

A rough estimate puts the devaluation of the property between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.

It is incorrect that there will be no financial impact for some time. If this Commission determines to go forward with this down zoning of Fairview Business Park, and recommends it to the Board of Supervisors, we will have to allocate resources, of time and money, to protect our investment. And those financial impacts will need to be financed immediately.

I neglected to inquire into, "why the zoning changes?", but from what I can gather, it is mainly just a housekeeping activity to try and clean up the Master Plan and Map, and make it look more uniform. I imagine this will look better on the map but in reality will pass problems down the line to the people working the desks and doing plan reviews, where they will have to be aware and make exceptions to the very clean and uniform map at the top, but the actual implementation of the exceptions by the front line city employees and the public people will be problematic. I hope that the concept, "function is more important than form", will prevail.

So, I ask this commission, to choose not to go forward with this, and not recommend the proposed down-zoning of parcel, 010-061-084, known as Fairview Business Park, at 1601 Fairview Drive.